arXiv:1412.6231v1 [stat.ME] 19 Dec 2014

Efficient strategy for the Markov chain Monte Carlo in high-dimension with heavy-tailed target probability distribution

Kengo KAMATANI*

Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University and JST, CREST

Dated: December 22, 2014

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a new Markov chain Monte Carlo method and exhibit its efficiency by simulation and high-dimensional asymptotic theory. Key fact is that our algorithm has a reversible proposal transition kernel, which is designed to have a heavy-tailed invariant probability distribution. The high-dimensional asymptotic theory is studied for a class of heavy-tailed target probability distribution. As the number of dimension of the state space goes to infinity, we will show that our algorithm has a much better convergence rate than that of the preconditioned Crank Nicolson (pCN) algorithm and the random-walk Metropolis (RWM) algorithm. We also show that our algorithm is at least as good as the pCN algorithm and better than the RWM algorithm for light-tailed target probability distribution.

Keywords: Markov chain; Consistency; Monte Carlo; Stein's method; Malliavin calculus

1 Introduction

The Markov chain Monte Calro (MCMC) method is a widely used technique for evaluation of complicated integrals, especially in high dimensional setting. A lot of new methods are developed in the past few decades. However it is still very difficult to choose an MCMC that works well for a given function and a given measure, which is called the target (probability) distributoin. The choice of MCMC heavily depends on the tail behaviour of the target probability distribution. In particular, it is well-known that many MCMC algorithms behave poorly for heavy-tailed target probability distribution.

In our previous work, in Kamatani (2014b), we studied some asymptotic properties of the random-walk Metropolis (RWM) algorithm for heavy-tailed target probability distribution. To perform RWM algorithm, we have to choose a proposal distribution. This choice heavily affects the performance. We showed that the most standard choice, the Gaussian proposal distribution attains the optimal rate of convergence, although this rate is quite poor. This rather disappointing fact illustrates that the RWM algorithm can not be so good. To find a more efficient strategy is an important unsolved problem.

A candidate of this, the preconditioned Crank-Nicolson (pCN) algorithm is first appeared in Beskos et al. (2009). The method is a simple modification of a classical Gaussian RWM algorithm and so their computational costs are almost the same. The efficiency for this simple candidate was provided in simulation by Cotter et al. (2013) and its theoretical benefit was provided in Beskos et al. (2009), Pillai et al. (2014), Eberle (2014) and Hairer et al. (2014). However our simulation shows that it works well only for a specific light-tailed target distribution and works quite poor otherwise, in particular, for heavy-tailed target probability distribution (in Theorem 3.1, we will prove it in terms of the convergence rate).

*Supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 24740062.

In this paper, we introduce a new algorithm which is a slight modification of the original pCN algorithm though their performances are completely different. It works well and is quite robust. Let us describe our new algorithm, the mixed preconditioned Crank-Nicolson (MpCN) algorithm. Let $P(\mathrm{d}x) = p(x)\mathrm{d}x$ be the target probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Fix $\rho \in (0,1)$. Set initial value $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\|x\| = (\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2)^{1/2}$. The algorithm goes as follows:

- Generate $r \sim \mathrm{Gamma}(d/2, \|x\|^2/2)$.
- Generate $x^* = \rho^{1/2}x + (1-\rho)^{1/2}r^{-1/2}w$ where w follows the standard normal distribution.
- Accept x^* as x with probability $\alpha(x, x^*)$, and otherwise, discard x^*, where

$$\alpha(x,y) = \min\left\{1, \frac{p(y)\|x\|^{-d}}{p(x)\|y\|^{-d}}\right\}.$$

In the above, $\mathrm{Gamma}(\nu, \alpha)$ is the Gamma distribution with the shape parameter ν and the scale parameter α with the probability distribution function $\propto x^{\nu-1}\exp(-\alpha x)$. In our simulation, we set $\rho = 0.8$. Key fact is that the proposal transition kernel of the algorithm has a heavy-tailed invariant probability distribution. Thus it is not surprising if the new method works better than the pCN algorithm for heavy-tailed target probability distribution. However we will show that the new method has the same convergence rate as the pCN algorithm even for light-tailed target probability distribution. Our method is robust, which is one of the most important property for MCMC.

We study its theoretical properties via high-dimensional asymptotic theory. The high-dimensional asymptotic theory for MCMC was first appeared in Roberts et al. (1997) and further developed in Roberts and Rosenthal (1998). See Cotter et al. (2013) for recent results. We use this framework together with the study of consistency of MCMC by Kamatani (2014a).

The main technical tools are Malliavin calculus and Stein's techniques. The reader is referred to Nualart (2006) for the former and Chen et al. (2011) for the latter and see Nourdin and Poly (2013) for the connection of the two fields. The analysis of this connection is a very active area of research and our paper illustrates usefulness of the analysis even for Bayesian computation.

The paper is organized as follows. The numerical simulations are provided in the right after this section. We also illustrate the limitation of the MpCN algorithm in Section 2.3.4. In Section 3, high-dimensional asymptotic properties will be studied. We will show that the pCN algorithm is worse than the classical RWM algorithm for heavy-tailed target probability distribution. On the other hand, the MpCN algorithm attains a better rate than the RWM algorithm. Proofs are relegated to Section 4. In the appendix, Section A includes a short introduction to Malliavin calculus and Stein's techniques. Section B provides some properties for consistency of MCMC.

Finally, we note that our new algorithm was already implemented for the Bayesian type estimation for ergodic diffusion process in Kamatani and Uchida (2014) (More precisely, a version of MpCN. See Section 3.4 for the detail). The target probability distribution is very complicated although it is not heavy-tailed. The performance of the Gaussian RWM algorithm was quite poor due to the complexity. However the new method worked well as described in Figure 1 of Kamatani and Uchida (2014). In our current study, we only describe usefulness of our algorithm for a class of heavy-tailed target probability distribution. However, this heavy-tail assumption is just an example of target probability distribution that is difficult to approximate by MCMC. Our method is robust, and we believe that the method is useful for non heavy-tailed complicated target probability distribution as illustrated in Kamatani and Uchida (2014).

1.1 Notation

Several norms are considered in this paper.

- For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_k),\ y = (y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, write $\|x\| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2\right)^{1/2}$ and $\langle x, y\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i y_i$. If h is in a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ with inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}$, write $\|h\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = \left(\langle h, h\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}\right)^{1/2}$.

- For a function $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$, write $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in E} |f(x)|$.
- If F is a real valued random variable on an abstract Wiener space $(W, \mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{P})$, write $\|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{1,2}} = (\mathbb{E}[F^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|DF\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}])^{1/2}$. When the abstract Wiener space $(W, \mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{P}_y)$ depends on $y \in (0, \infty)$, write $\|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{1,2}_\delta} = \sup_{y\in[\delta,\delta^{-1}]}(\mathbb{E}_y[F^2] + \mathbb{E}_y[\|DF\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}])^{1/2}$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$.
- If ν is a signed measure on $(E, \mathcal{E})$, write $\|\nu\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \sup_{A\in\mathcal{E}} |\nu(A)|$. The integral with respect to ν is denoted by $\nu(f) = \int_E f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)$. In particular, $Nf = \mathbb{E}[f(X)],\ X \sim N(0, 1)$.

Write $N_d(\mu, \Sigma)$ for the d-dimensional normal distribution with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and variance covariance matrix Σ, and $\phi_d(x; \mu, \Sigma)$ be its probability distribution function. When $d = 1$, write $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ and $\phi(x; \mu, \sigma^2)$ with respectively. We also denote the d-dimensional standard normal distribution briefly by N_d and write $N = N_1$. Write I_d for the $d \times d$-identity matrix. Write $\mathcal{L}(X)$ or $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}(X)$ for the law of random variable X. Write $X_n \Rightarrow X$ if the law of X_n converges weakly to that of X. Write $X|Y$ for the conditional distribution of X given Y.

2 The MpCN algorithm and its performance

In this section, we describe two Metropolis-Hastings algorithms. The Metropolis-Hastings algorithm generates a Markov chain $\{X_m\}_m$ with transition kernel $K(x, \mathrm{d}y)$ on $(E, \mathcal{E})$ defined by the following: Set $X_0 \in E$ and for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{cases} X^*_m \sim R(X_{m-1}, \mathrm{d}x) \\ X_m = \begin{cases} X^*_m & \text{with probability } \alpha(X_{m-1}, X^*_m) \\ X_{m-1} & \text{with probability } 1 - \alpha(X_{m-1}, X^*_m) \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

where $R(x, \mathrm{d}y)$ is called the proposal transition kernel, and $\alpha(x, y)$ is called the acceptance ratio that satisfy

$$P(\mathrm{d}x)R(x, \mathrm{d}y)\alpha(x, y) = P(\mathrm{d}y)R(y, \mathrm{d}x)\alpha(y, x) \tag{2.1}$$

where $P(\mathrm{d}x)$ is the target probability distribution. The Markov chain is called reversible with respect to $P(\mathrm{d}x)$ if

$$P(\mathrm{d}x)K(x, \mathrm{d}y) = P(\mathrm{d}y)K(y, \mathrm{d}x).$$

If the acceptance ratio satisfies (2.1), then the Markov chain has reversibility. See monograph Robert and Casella (2004) or review Tierney (1994) for further details.

2.1 The pCN algorithm

Let P_d be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with density $p_d(x)$. In this paper, the following algorithm that generate a Markov chain $X^d = \left\{X^d_m\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is called the preconditioned Crank-Nicolson (pCN) algorithm for the target probability distribution P_d if X^d_0 is a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable, and for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{cases} X^{d*}_m = \sqrt{\rho}X^d_{m-1} + \sqrt{1-\rho}W^d_m,\ W^d_m \sim N_d(0, I_d) \\ X^d_m = \begin{cases} X^{d*}_m & \text{with probability } \alpha_d(X^d_{m-1}, X^{d*}_m) \\ X^d_{m-1} & \text{with probability } 1 - \alpha_d(X^d_{m-1}, X^{d*}_m) \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\alpha_d(x, y) = \min\{1, p_d(y)\phi_d(x; 0, I_d)/p_d(x)\phi_d(y; 0, I_d)\}$. Write $\mathrm{pCN}(P_d)$ for the law $\mathcal{L}(X^d)$ if $X^d_0 \sim P_d$. The conditional distribution $X^{d*}_m|X^d_{m-1}$ is given by the following joint distribution:

$$(X^d_{m-1}, X^{d*}_m) \sim N_{2d}\left(0, \begin{pmatrix} I_d & \sqrt{\rho}I_d \\ \sqrt{\rho}I_d & I_d \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

In particular, if $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ and $X^d_0 \sim P_d$, each X^d_m is always accepted and it becomes a d-dimensional AR(1) process.

2.2 The MpCN algorithm

In this paper, we propose the following algorithm that generate a Markov chain $X^d = \left\{X_m^d\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$: Set X_0^d as a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable, and for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{cases} Z_m^d \sim \mathrm{InvGamma}(d/2, \|X_{m-1}^d\|^2/2) \\ X_m^{d*} = \sqrt{\rho}X_{m-1}^d + \sqrt{(1-\rho)Z_m^d}W_m^d,\ W_m^d \sim N_d(0, I_d) \\ X_m^d = \begin{cases} X_m^{d*} & \text{with probability } \alpha_d(X_{m-1}^d, X_m^{d*}) \\ X_{m-1}^d & \text{with probability } 1-\alpha_d(X_{m-1}^d, X_m^{d*}) \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\alpha_d(x,y) = \min\left\{1, p_d(y)\|x\|^{-d}/p_d(x)\|y\|^{-d}\right\}$, and $\mathrm{InvGamma}(\nu,\alpha)$ is the inverse Gamma distribution with the shape parameter ν and the scale parameter α with density

$$g(z;\nu,\alpha) = 1_{(0,\infty)}(z)\frac{\alpha^\nu}{\Gamma(\nu)}z^{-\nu-1}\exp(-\alpha/z).$$

In this paper, this algorithm is called the mixed preconditioned Crank-Nicolson (MpCN) algorithm for the target probability distribution P_d. Write $\mathrm{MpCN}(P_d)$ for the law $\mathcal{L}(X^d)$ if $X_0^d \sim P_d$. Formally, the conditional distribution $X_m^{d*}|X_{m-1}^d$ is given by the following joint distribution:

$$(X_{m-1}^d, X_m^{d*})|Z_m^d \sim N_{2d}\left(0, Z_m^d\begin{pmatrix} I_d & \sqrt{\rho}I_d \\ \sqrt{\rho}I_d & I_d \end{pmatrix}\right), Z_m^d \sim \overline{Q}$$

when $\overline{Q}(\mathrm{d}x) = 1_{(0,\infty)}(x)x^{-1}\mathrm{d}x$. By this structure, the transition kernel is reversible with respect to

$$\overline{P}_d(\mathrm{d}x) \propto \int_{z\in(0,\infty)} \phi_d(x, 0, zI_d)\overline{Q}(\mathrm{d}z)\mathrm{d}x \propto \|x\|^{-d}\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.4}$$

Since $\overline{P}_d$ and $\overline{Q}$ are improper (not probability measures but σ-finite measures), the above argument is just a formal sense. This argument is justified by the following.

Lemma 2.1. *The proposal transition kernel of the MpCN algorithm is reversible with respect to a σ-finite measure $\overline{P}_d(\mathrm{d}x) = \overline{p}_d(x)\mathrm{d}x = \|x\|^{-d}\mathrm{d}x$, and the transition kernel of the MpCN algorithm is reversible with respect to P_d.*

Proof. Write $R_d(x,\mathrm{d}x^*) = \int_{z\in(0,\infty)} R_d(x,\mathrm{d}z)R_d(x,z,\mathrm{d}x^*)$ for the proposal transition kernel of the MpCN algorithm where

$$R_d(x,\mathrm{d}z) = \mathrm{InvGamma}(d/2, \|x\|^2/2),\ R_d(x,z,dx^*) = N_d(\sqrt{\rho}x, (1-\rho)zI_d).$$

Then

$$\overline{P}_d(\mathrm{d}x)R_d(x,\mathrm{d}z)R_d(x,z,\mathrm{d}x^*) \propto \phi_{2d}\left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ x^* \end{pmatrix}; \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, z\begin{pmatrix} I_d & \sqrt{\rho}I_d \\ \sqrt{\rho}I_d & I_d \end{pmatrix}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{z}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}x^*.$$

Since the right-hand side is exchangeable with respect to x and x^*, the proposal transition kernel $R_d(x,\mathrm{d}x^*)$ is reversible with respect to $\overline{P}_d$. For the latter case, it is sufficient to show

$$P_d(\mathrm{d}x)R_d(x,\mathrm{d}x^*)\alpha_d(x,x^*) = P_d(\mathrm{d}x^*)R_d(x^*,\mathrm{d}x)\alpha_d(x^*,x).$$

However, the left-hand side of the above is

$$\overline{P}_d(\mathrm{d}x)R_d(x,\mathrm{d}x^*)\frac{p_d}{\overline{p}_d}(x)\alpha_d(x,x^*) = \overline{P}_d(\mathrm{d}x)R_d(x,\mathrm{d}x^*)\min\left\{\frac{p_d}{\overline{p}_d}(x), \frac{p_d}{\overline{p}_d}(x^*)\right\}.$$

Since $R_d(x,dx^*)$ is reversible with respect to $\overline{P}_d$, the right-hand side of the above is again, exchangeable with respect to x and x^*. Hence the claim follows. □

2.3 Numerical results

We consider two kinds of numerical experiments.

Efficiency of MpCN algorithm: In Sections 2.3.1-2.3.3, we illustrate efficiency of the MpCN algorithm. We will compare two RWM algorithms and the pCN and MpCN algorithms with $M = 10^8$ iterations (no burn-in) for each. The algorithms we consider are

1. The RWM algorithm with Gaussian proposal distribution. More precisely, the update x^* from the current value x is generated by $x^* = x + \sigma_d \epsilon$ where ϵ follows the standard normal distribution and $\sigma_d^2 = 1/d$ in this simulation.
2. The RWM algorithm with the t-distribution as the proposal distribution (two degrees of freedom). More precisely, $x^* = x + \sigma_d \epsilon$ where ϵ follows the t-distribution with two degrees of freedom and $\sigma_d^2 = 1/d$ in this simulation.
3. The pCN algorithm for $\rho = 0.8$.
4. The MpCN algorithm for $\rho = 0.8$.

The target probability distributions are the following.

(a) The standard normal distribution.

(b) The t-distribution (two degrees of freedom).

(c) A perturbation of the t-distribution.

For each target probability distribution and each algorithm, we generate a single Markov chain $\left\{X_m^d\right\}_m$ with initial value $X_0^d \sim N_d(0, I_d)$ and plot four figures as in Figure 1.



Figure 1: The RWM algorithm with Gaussian proposal distribution for $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ for $d = 2$.

This example is just for an illustration. The target probability distribution is the two dimensional standard normal distribution and the MCMC is the RWM algorithm with Gaussian proposal distribution. These four plots are

(i) Trajectory of the normalised distance from the origin. When the target probability distribution is the standard normal distribution, we plot $\left\{(2d)^{-1/2}(\|X_m^d\|^2 - d)\right\}_m$ and for other cases, we plot $\left\{\|X_m^d\|^2/d\right\}_m$ (upper left).

(ii) The autocorrelation plot of the above (bottom left).

(iii) Trajectory $\{X^d_{m,1}\}_m$ where $X^d_m = (X^d_{m,1}, \ldots, X^d_{m,d})$ (upper right).

(iv) The autocorrelation plot of the above (bottom right).

The simulation results are illustrated in Sections 2.3.1-2.3.3.

Shift perturbation effect: We also illustrate the limitation of our algorithm and how to avoid it in Section 2.3.4. The target probability distribution is $P_d(\xi\mathbf{1} - \mathrm{d}x)$ where $\mathbf{1} = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$\xi = 0, 1, 2, 3, \text{ or } 4$$

and P_d is

(a) the standard normal distribution, or

(b) the t-distribution (two degrees of freedom).

We plot

(ii) the autocorrelation plot of $\left\{(2d)^{-1/2}(\|X^d_m - \xi\mathbf{1}\|^2 - d)\right\}_m$ for the standard normal distribution, and plot that of $\left\{\|X^d_m - \xi\mathbf{1}\|^2/d\right\}_m$ for the t-distribution for $\xi \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Although we can not apply our theoretical results in this non-spherically symmetric target distribution, it is a good example to illustrate the limitation of our algorithm. The performance of MCMC for the shift $\xi\mathbf{1}$ will illustrate shift sensitivity of the MCMC algorithms. The RWM algorithms are, essentially, free from the shift. However the pCN and MpCN are sensitive for this effect. Fortunately, this effect can be avoided by simple estimate of the peak. We will show the results with and without this peak estimation.

Since RWM algorithm is free from this effect, we only consider the pCN and MpCN algorithms. We can compare the results in this section to that of the RWM algorithms in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. We set $\rho = 0.8$ and set $X^d_0 \sim N_d(0, I_d)$.

2.3.1 The Standard normal distribution in $\mathbb{R}^{20}$

Set $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ for $d = 20$. For this case, the optimal convergence rate for the RWM algorithm is d, and the Gaussian proposal distribution attains this rate (Theorem 3.1 of Kamatani (2014b)). On the other hand, the pCN and MpCN algorithms attains consistency and so these algorithms are better than the optimal RWM algorithm (Theorems 3.1 and 3.2). The simulation shows that the performance of the RWM algorithm for the Gaussian proposal and the t-distribution proposal are similar (Figures 2 and 3), and that for the pCN and MpCN algorithms are also similar (Figures 4 and 5) and are much better than the former two algorithms.



Figure 2: The RWM algorithm with Gaussian proposal distribution for $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ for $d = 20$.



Figure 3: The RWM algorithm with t-distribution as the proposal distribution for $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ for $d = 20$.



Figure 4: The pCN algorithm for $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ for $d = 20$.



Figure 5: The MpCN algorithm for $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$ for $d = 20$.

2.3.2 P_d is the t-distribution with two degrees of freedom in $\mathbb{R}^{20}$

Set P_d as the t-distribution with $\nu = 2$ degrees of freedom with the location parameter $\mu = 0$ and the scale parameter $\sigma = 5$ for $d = 20$. Recall that the probability distribution function is given by

$$p_d(x) = \frac{\Gamma((\nu + d)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2)\nu^{d/2}\pi^{d/2}\sigma^d(1 + \|(x - \mu)/\sigma\|^2/\nu)^{(\nu+d)/2}}.$$

For this case, the optimal convergence rate for the RWM algorithm is d^2, and the Gaussian proposal distribution attains this rate (Theorem 3.2 of Kamatani (2014b)). The pCN algorithm is much worse than the rate, and the MpCN algorithm attains much better rate d (Theorems 3.1 and 3.3). In simulation, the MpCN algorithm (Figure 9) is much better than other algorithms (Figures 6-8) which corresponds to the theoretical result.



Figure 6: The RWM algorithm with Gaussian proposal distribution when t-distribution is the target distribution.



Figure 7: The RWM algorithm with t-distribution as the proposal distribution and the target distribution is also the t-distribution.



Figure 8: The pCN algorithm when t-distribution is the target probability distribution.



Figure 9: The MpCN algorithm when t-distribution is the target probability distribution.

2.3.3 A perturbation of the t-distribution

We show the performance of the MpCN algorithm when the target distribution is not spherically symmetric. Let P_{20} be a probability measure in $\mathbb{R}^{20}$ with the probability distribution function

$$p_{20}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{20}) \propto \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{20} \left(\frac{x_i - 1}{5}\right)^2 + |x_1| + \sin(x_2)/2\right)^{-(4+20)/2}.$$

The distribution is not scaled mixture and so we can not say anything for the convergence rate for this case. However by simulation we observe that the MpCN algorithm (Figure 13) is much better than other algorithms (Figures 10-12).



Figure 10: The RWM algorithm with Gaussian proposal distribution when the perturbed t-distribution is the target probability distribution.



Figure 11: The RWM algorithm with t-distribution as the proposal distribution and the target probability distribution is the perturbed t-distribution.



Figure 12: The pCN algorithm when the perturbed t-distribution is the target probability distribution.



Figure 13: The MpCN algorithm when the perturbed t-distribution is the target probability distribution.

2.3.4 Shift-perturbation of spherically symmetric target distributions

Let $P_d = N_d(\xi \mathbf{1}, I_d)$, where $\xi = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ for $d = 20$ and consider the pCN and MpCN algorithms. Compare the results of the RWM algorithms in Section 2.3.1 (bottom left figures of Figures 2 and 3). Figure 14 illustrates that although the performances of pCN and MpCN algorithms are much better than the RWM algorithms when $\xi = 0$, it is sensitive to the value of ξ. Therefore for the light-tail target distribution in high-dimension, when the high-probability region is far from the origin, it is important to shift the target distribution in advance. For example, first, calculate rough estimate $\hat{\xi}$ of the peak of the target distribution $P_d(\mathrm{d}x)$, and then run the MCMC algorithm for $P_d(-\hat{\xi} + \mathrm{d}x)$. Some tempering strategy might be useful for the rough estimate of the peak as in Kamatani and Uchida (2014).



Figure 14: Autocorrelation plots for the pCN and MpCN algorithms for shifted normal distributions.

Next figure (Figure 15) is a result of the pCN and MpCN algorithm with a simple peak estimation. We run $M = 10^3$ iteration of the pCN or MpCN algorithm to calculate

$$\hat{\xi} = M^{-1} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} X_m^d \tag{2.5}$$

and then run $M = 10^8$ iteration of the pCN or MpCN algorithm for the target probability distribution $P_d(-\hat{\xi} + \mathrm{d}x)$. The effect of the shift is considerably weakened.



Figure 15: Autocorrelation plots for the pCN and MpCN algorithms for shifted normal distributions with an initial estimate of the peak.

We consider the t-distribution with $\nu = 2$ and $\sigma = 5$ where $\xi = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ for $d = 20$. Compare the results in Section 2.3.2 for the RWM algorithms (bottom left figures of Figures 6 and 7). Compared to the light-tailed distribution, the effect of the shift is small for the MpCN algorithm and the five autocorrelation plots are overlapped in Figure 16.



Figure 16: Autocorrelation plots for the pCN and MpCN algorithms for shifted t-distributions.

The next figure (Figure 17), which is almost identical to the previous one, is a result of $M = 10^8$ iteration of the pCN and MpCN algorithm with a simple peak estimation (2.5) by $M = 10^3$ iteration. Thus for heavy-tailed target distribution, the effect of shift perturbation is small, and the gain of the peak estimation is also small.



Figure 17: Autocorrelation plots for the pCN and MpCN algorithms for shifted t-distributions with an initial estimate of the peak.

3 High-dimensional asymptotic theory

We consider a sequence of the target probability distributions $\{P_d\}_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ indexed by the number of dimension d. For a given d, P_d is a d-dimensional probability distribution that is a scale mixture of the normal distribution. Furthermore, our asymptotic setting is that the number of dimension d goes infinity while the mixing distribution Q of P_d is unchanged.

Note that in our results, stationarity and reversibility are essential. However this can be weakened as explained in Lemma 4 of Kamatani (2014a).

3.1 Consistency

In this section, we review consistency of MCMC studied in Kamatani (2014a). Set a sequence of Markov chains $\xi^d := \left\{\xi_m^d; m\in\mathbb{N}_0\right\}$ $(d\in\mathbb{N})$ with the invariant probability distributions $\{\Pi_d\}_d$. The law of ξ^d is called consistent if

$$\frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} f(\xi_m^d) - \Pi_d(f) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \tag{3.1}$$

for any $M, d\to\infty$ for any bounded continuous function f. This says that the integral $\Pi_d(f)$ we want to calculate is approximated by a Monte Carlo simulated value $\frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} f(\xi_m^d)$ after a reasonable number of iteration M. For example, regular Gibbs sampler should satisfy this type of property (more precisely, local consistency. See Kamatani (2014a)) when d is the sample size of the data. In the current case, the state space for $X^d = \left\{X_m^d; m\in\mathbb{N}_0\right\}$ $(d\in\mathbb{N})$ changes as $d\to\infty$ that is inconvenient for further analysis. As in Kamatani (2014b), to overcome the difficulty, we set a projection $\pi_E = \pi_{d,E}$ for a finite subset $E\subset\{1,\dots,d\}$ by

$$\pi_E(x) = (x_i)_{i\in E}\ (x = (x_i)_{i=1,\dots,d}).$$

Definition 1 (Consistency). *We call that the law of a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued Markov chain $\left\{X_m^d\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is consistent if*

$$\frac{1}{M_d}\sum_{m=0}^{M_d-1} f\circ\pi_{E_d^k}(X_m^d) - P_d(f\circ\pi_{E_d^k}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \tag{3.2}$$

as $d\to\infty$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $M_d\to\infty$ and for any bounded continuous function $f:\mathbb{R}^k\to\mathbb{R}$ and any k-elements E_d^k of $\{1,\dots,d\}$.

We write π_k for $\pi_{\{1,\dots,k\}}$. In Kamatani (2014b), the role of E_d^k is important, but in this paper, we can assume that $\pi_{E_d^k} = \pi_k$ throughout in this paper due to rotational symmetricity of the pCN and MpCN algorithms. As in Kamatani (2014b), we relax the condition for M_d and introduce the convergence rate.

Definition 2 (Weak Consistency). *We call that the law of a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued Markov chain $\left\{X_m^d\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is weakly consistent with rate T_d if (3.2) is satisfied for any $M_d\to\infty$ such that $M_d/T_d\to\infty$. We will call the rate T_d, the convergence rate. If $T_d/d^k\to 0$ for some $k\in\mathbb{N}$, we call that it has a polynomial rate of convergence.*

The rate T_d corresponds to the number of iteration until good convergence. Therefore smaller is better. In Kamatani (2014b), we showed that the optimal rate for the RWM algorithm is d^2 for heavy-tailed target probability distribution. We will show that this rate becomes d for the MpCN algorithm. Note that when the MCMC is consistent, the convergence rate is $T_d = 1$.

3.2 Assumption for the target probability distribution

Let $Q(\mathrm{d}z)$ be a probability measure on $(0,\infty)$. Let P_d be a scale mixture of the normal distribution defined by

$$P_d = \mathcal{L}(X_0^d),\ Q_d = \mathcal{L}(\|X_0^d\|^2/d)$$

where $X_0^d|Z \sim N_d(0, ZI_d)$ and $Z \sim Q$. We will write

$$P_d = P_d(Q). \tag{3.3}$$

In particular, $P_d(\delta_{\{1\}}) = N_d(0, I_d)$. Note that $Q_d \Rightarrow Q$ as $d \to \infty$ since $\|X_0^d\|^2/d \to Z$ a.s. In this setup, P_d and Q_d have probability distribution functions p_d and q_d that satisfy

$$p_d(x) \propto \|x\|^{2-d} q_d\left(\frac{\|x\|^2}{d}\right).$$

If $P_d = P_d(Q)$, the acceptance ratio of the MpCN algorithm defined in (2.3) can be written in the following form:

$$\alpha_d(x, y) = \min\left\{1, \frac{\tilde{q}_d\left(\frac{\|y\|^2}{d}\right)}{\tilde{q}_d\left(\frac{\|x\|^2}{d}\right)}\right\} \tag{3.4}$$

where $\tilde{q}_d(x) = xq_d(x)$. We will assume the following regularity condition on Q to show some properties of the MpCN algorithm.

Assumption 1. *Probability distribution Q has the strictly positive continuously differentiable probability distribution function $q(y)$. Each $q(y)$ and $q'(y)$ vanishes at $+0$ and $+\infty$.*

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma 2.2 of Kamatani (2014b))**.** *Under Assumption 1,* $\lim_{d\to\infty} \|q_d - q\|_\infty = 0$ *and* $\lim_{d\to\infty} \|q_d' - q'\|_\infty = 0$.

Probability distribution $P_d(Q)$ that satisfies above includes many heavy-tailed probability distributions such as the t-distribution and the stable distribution. See Kamatani (2014b).

3.3 Main results

Even for Gaussian target probability distribution, the pCN algorithm may not work well. If the target probability distribution $P_d(Q)$ is different from $N_d(0, I_d)$, then any polynomial number of iteration is not sufficient for the pCN algorithm to have a good approximation of the integral we want to calculate.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $P_d = P_d(Q)$. Then* pCN(P_d) *have the polynomial rate of convergence if and only if $Q = \delta_{\{1\}}$. If $Q = \delta_{\{1\}}$, then* pCN(P_d) *has consistency.*

Proof. The results for $Q \neq \delta_{\{1\}}$ comes from Lemma 4.3. Consistency for $Q = \delta_{\{1\}}$ comes from Lemma 4.1. □

On the other hand, the MpCN algorithm always works well for light-tailed target distribution. More precisely, the following holds:

Theorem 3.2. MpCN(P_d) *is consistent for $P_d = N_d(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$ for any $\sigma > 0$.*

Proof. By considering consistency of $\left\{X_m^d/\sigma\right\}_m$, it is sufficient to prove for $\sigma = 1$, which is proved in Lemma 4.1. □

When P_d is a heavy-tailed distribution, we already know that the pCN algorithm does not work well by Theorem 3.1. However, the MpCN algorithm still has a good convergence property. Recall that the optimal convergence rate for the RWM algorithm is d^2 as studied in Kamatani (2014b). Let $[x]$ denote the integer part of $x > 0$. See Section 3.4 for the proof of Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.3.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Q satisfy Assumption 1 and $P_d = P_d(Q)$. Set $X^d \sim$* MpCN(P_d)*, and let $Y_t^d = r_d(X_{[dt]}^d)$. Then $Y^d = (Y_t^d)_t$ converges to the stationary ergodic process $Y = (Y_t)_t$ (in Skorohod's topology) that is the solution of*

$$\mathrm{d}Y_t = a(Y_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{b(Y_t)}\mathrm{d}W_t; Y_0 \sim Q \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$a(y) = 2(2y + (\log q)'(y)y^2)(1-\rho),\ b(y) = 4y^2(1-\rho).$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let Q satisfy Assumption 1 and $P_d = P_d(Q)$. Then* MpCN(P_d) *has the convergence rate d.*

3.4 Discussion

- In Kamatani (2014b), we defined optimality among all the RWM algorithms. In the current study, it is difficult to find suitable sense of optimality. Naïve sense of optimality may not work. We can find a rather impractical MCMC that is consistent for any $P_d(Q)$ by making a mixture of the MpCN algorithm and independent type Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with the proposal probability distribution $P_d(Q^*)$ for any Q^* that satisfies Assumption 1. To construct a practically useful sense of optimality is an open problem. I believe that the MpCN algorithm has a kind of optimality.

- Proposal transition kernel used in MpCN has the invariant distribution $\overline{P}_d$ defined in (2.4), and so this is a special case of MCMC that uses reversible proposal transition kernel. The relation to the target probability distribution P_d and $\overline{P}_d$ is quite important. If $\overline{P}_d$ has a heavier-tail than that of P_d, then MCMC behaves relatively well. On the other hand, if $\overline{P}_d$ has a lighter-tail, it becomes quite poor. The RWM algorithm has $\overline{P}_d =$ Uniform distribution. This is a robust choice, but it loses efficiency to pay the price as described in Kamatani (2014b). On the other hand, the pCN algorithm, which has $\overline{P}_d = N_d(0, I_d)$, does not work well except some specific cases. The proposed algorithm, MpCN is in the middle of these algorithms. It is robust and works well.

- It is possible to consider a more general class of the MpCN algorithm: Let $\overline{Q}$ be a σ-finite measure on $(0, \infty)$ and set $\overline{P}_d = P_d(\overline{Q})$ with density $\overline{p}_d$. For $m \geq 1$, set

$$\begin{cases} Z_m^d \sim \phi_d(X_{m-1}^d; 0, zI_d)\overline{Q}(\mathrm{d}z) \\ X_m^{d*} = \sqrt{\rho}X_{m-1}^d + \sqrt{(1-\rho)Z_m^d}W_m^d,\ W_m^d \sim N_d(0, I_d) \\ X_m^d = \begin{cases} X_m^{d*} & \text{with probability } \alpha_d(X_{m-1}^d, X_m^{d*}) \\ X_{m-1}^d & \text{with probability } 1 - \alpha_d(X_{m-1}^d, X_m^{d*}) \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

  where $\alpha_d(x, y) = \min\{1, p_d(y)\overline{p}_d(x)/p_d(x)\overline{p}_d(y)\}$ assuming that $\int \phi_d(x; 0, zI_d)\overline{Q}(\mathrm{d}z) < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For example, in Kamatani and Uchida (2014), $\overline{Q}(\mathrm{d}z) \propto z^{-\nu/2-1}e^{-\nu/(2z)}$. If $\overline{Q}$ satisfies Assumption 1, then this algorithm has the same asymptotic property as our MpCN algorithm and our algorithm is a special case $\overline{Q}(\mathrm{d}z) = z^{-1}\mathrm{d}z$. We believe that the choice of $\overline{Q}$ has a little effect in practice.

- There is no theoretical results for the MpCN algorithm for target probability distributions with shift perturbation discussed in Section 2.3.4. It might be possible to study scaling limit theorem for this direction.

- The class of target probability distributions we considered is quite restrictive. The extension of the class is not straightforward and probably it requires some new techniques. However as illustrated in simulation, we believe that by using our restrictive class, we successfully described the real behaviour of the MCMC algorithms and it will be surprising if we find a completely different story by generalising this class.

4 Proofs

Let $K_\delta = [\delta, \delta^{-1}]$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

4.1 Consistency results for Gaussian target probability distribution

By definition, the pCN algorithm defined in (2.2) has the following form:

$$\|X_1^{d*}\|^2 - \|X_0^d\|^2 = -(1-\rho)\|X_0^d\|^2 + 2\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)}\left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d \right\rangle + (1-\rho)\|W_1^d\|^2. \tag{4.1}$$

The MpCN algorithm defined in (2.3) has a similar form

$$\begin{aligned}\|X_1^{d*}\|^2 - \|X_0^d\|^2 &= -(1-\rho)\|X_0^d\|^2 + 2\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)Z_1^d}\left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d\right\rangle + (1-\rho)Z_1^d\|W_1^d\|^2 \\ &= 2\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)Z_1^d}\left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d\right\rangle + (1-\rho)Z_1^d\left(\|W_1^d\|^2 - \frac{\|X_0^d\|^2}{Z_1^d}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The conditional law of $\|X_0^d\|^2/Z_1^d$ given X_0^d is chi-squared distribution with d degrees of freedom and so we will write $\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|^2 = \|X_0^d\|^2/Z_1^d$ where $\tilde{W}_1^d \sim N_d(0, I_d)$. By this notation, the above becomes

$$\|X_1^{d*}\|^2 - \|X_0^d\|^2 = 2\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)Z_1^d}\left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d\right\rangle + (1-\rho)Z_1^d\left(\|W_1^d\|^2 - \|\tilde{W}_1^d\|^2\right). \tag{4.3}$$

Lemma 4.1. *If $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$, then* pCN(P_d) *and* MpCN(P_d) *are consistent.*

Proof. When $P_d = N_d(0, I_d)$, the k-dimensional process $\left\{\pi_k(X_m^d)\right\}_m$ is a Markov chain for the pCN algorithm. Moreover, it is a stationary ergodic AR(1) process since the acceptance ratio is $\alpha_d(x, y) \equiv 1$ $(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d)$ for this case. Since the law of this AR(1) process does not depend on d, consistency of pCN(P_d) comes from classical point-wise ergodic theorem.

Now we assume $X^d \sim$ MpCN(P_d) and set

$$r_d(x) = (2d)^{-1/2}(\|x\|^2 - d) \ (x \in \mathbb{R}^d).$$

For this case, $\left\{\pi_k(X_m^d)\right\}_m$ is not a Markov chain, but $\left\{\left(r_d(X_m^d), \pi_k(X_m^d)\right)\right\}_m$ is a Markov chain. Set

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} R_m^d = r_d(X_m^d) \\ R_m^{d*} = r_d(X_m^{d*}) \end{array}\right. , \quad \left\{\begin{array}{l} S_m^d = \pi_k(X_m^d) \\ S_m^{d*} = \pi_k(X_m^{d*}) \end{array}\right. .$$

To prove consistency by using Lemma B.1, we need to show weak convergence of the process $\left\{(R_m^d, S_m^d)\right\}_m$ to the limit process $\{(R_m, S_m)\}_m$ defined below, and ergodicity of this limit: for $m \geq 1$,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \begin{pmatrix} R_m^* \\ S_m^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{m-1} + \sqrt{2(1-\rho)}W_m^R, \\ \sqrt{\rho}S_{m-1} + \sqrt{1-\rho}W_m^S \end{pmatrix}, \ W_m^R \sim N(0,1), \ W_m^S \sim N_k(0, I_k), \\ \begin{pmatrix} R_m \\ S_m \end{pmatrix} = \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \begin{pmatrix} R_m^* \\ S_m^* \end{pmatrix} & \text{with probability } \alpha(R_{m-1}, R_m^*), \\ \begin{pmatrix} R_{m-1} \\ S_{m-1} \end{pmatrix} & \text{with probability } 1 - \alpha(R_{m-1}, R_m^*), \end{array}\right. \end{array}\right.$$

where $\alpha(x, y) = \min\left\{1, \exp(-y^2/2 + x^2/2)\right\}$ and $R_0 \sim N(0,1)$, $S_0 \sim N_k(0, I_k)$. Note that the Markov chain $\{(R_m, S_m)\}_m$ has the same law as that generated by the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with the target probability distribution $N_{k+1}(0, I_{k+1})$. First we prove the weak convergence. It can be proved by total variation convergence

$$\|\mathcal{L}(R_0^d, S_0^d, R_1^{d*}, S_1^{d*}) - \mathcal{L}(R_0, S_0, R_1^*, S_1^*)\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \to 0 \tag{4.4}$$

by Lemmas B.3 and B.4 since both $\{(R_m^d, S_m^d)\}_m$ and $\{(R_m, S_m)\}_m$ are generated by Metropolis-Hastings algorithms. For (4.4), it is sufficient to show

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} \|\mathcal{L}(F_d) - N_{2k+2}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = 0 \text{ where } F_d = \left(R_0^d, S_0^d, \frac{R_1^{d*} - R_0^d}{\sqrt{2(1-\rho)}}, \frac{S_1^{d*} - \sqrt{\rho}S_0^d}{\sqrt{1-\rho}}\right) \tag{4.5}$$

where, by (4.3),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{R_1^{d*} - R_0^d}{\sqrt{2(1-\rho)}} &= \sqrt{\rho Z_1^d}d^{-1/2}\left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d\right\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{2}}Z_1^d\left(r_d(W_1^d) - r_d(\tilde{W}_1^d)\right) \\ &= \sqrt{\rho Z_1^d}d^{-1/2}\left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d\right\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{2}}\left(Z_1^d r_d(W_1^d) - (Z_1^d - 1)r_d(\tilde{W}_1^d) - r_d(\tilde{W}_1^d)\right), \\ \frac{S_1^{d*} - \sqrt{\rho}S_0^d}{\sqrt{1-\rho}} &= \sqrt{Z_1^d}\pi_k(W_1^d).\end{aligned}$$

We decompose F_d into the sum of the following random variables:

$$F_{d,1} = \left(R_0^d, S_0^d, -\sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{2}} r_d(\tilde{W}_1^d), 0 \right),$$
$$F_{d,2} = \left(0, 0, \sqrt{\rho Z_1^d} d^{-1/2} \left\langle W_1^d, X_0^d \right\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{2}} \left(Z_1^d r_d(W_1^d) - (Z_1^d - 1) r_d(\tilde{W}_1^d) \right), \sqrt{Z_1^d} \pi_k(W_1^d) \right).$$

We show

$$\mathcal{L}(F_{d,1}) \Rightarrow N_{2k+2}(0, A),\ \mathcal{L}(F_{d,2}|F_{d,1}) \Rightarrow N_{2k+2}(0, B) \text{ in probability}, \tag{4.6}$$

where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_k & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-\rho}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1+\rho}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

The former convergence of (4.6) is an easy conclusion of Slutsky's lemma. For the latter, we use Skorohod's representation theorem. By using this, we can assume $F_{d,1}(\omega) \to F_1(\omega) \sim N_{2k+2}(0, A)$ for each ω, and $\sigma(F_{d,1})$-measurable random variables $Z_1^d - 1$ and $(Z_1^d - 1) r_d(\tilde{W}_1^d)$ converges to 0 for each ω. Then the latter convergence of (4.6) also comes from Slutsky's lemma.

Observe that the random variable $F_{d,1}$, and the random variable $F_{d,2}$ conditioned on $F_{d,1}$ are composed by the first and the second Wiener chaoses. Therefore, by Theorem A.1, convergences in (4.6) also imply the total variation convergences. Hence the law of $F_d = F_{d,1} + F_{d,2}$ converges in total variation to N_{2k+2}, and therefore, the weak convergence of $\{(R_m^d, S_m^d)\}_m$ follows.

Finally we prove the ergodicity of the process $\{(R_m, S_m)\}_m$. However this follows by Corollary 2 of Tierney (1994) and hence the claim follows.

□

4.2 Inconsistency for the pCN algorithm

In this and subsequent section, we set

$$r_d(x) = \frac{\|x\|^2}{d}\ (x \in \mathbb{R}^d)$$

and write $R_m^d = r_d(X_m^d)$ and $R_m^{d*} = r_d(X_m^{d*})$. Let $\mathrm{int}(A)$ be the interior of a set A.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $P_d = P_d(Q)$. For $\left\{X_m^d\right\}_m \sim \mathrm{pCN}(P_d)$, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and any compact subset K of $(0, \infty) \backslash \{1\}$, we have*

$$d^p \mathbb{P}(R_0^d \in K, X_0^d \neq X_1^d) = o(1).$$

Proof. Let $\overline{R}_m^d = r_d(X_m^d) - 1$ and $\overline{R}_m^{d*} = r_d(X_m^{d*}) - 1$ be the "centered" version of R_m^d and R_m^{d*}. Let I_0 and I_1 be any compact subsets of $(-1, \infty) \backslash \{0\}$ such that

$$\rho I_0 \subset \mathrm{int}(I_1) \text{ or } I_1 \subset \mathrm{int}(\rho I_0) \tag{4.7}$$

where $\rho A = \{\rho x; x \in A\}$. For the former case in (4.7), for $\epsilon = \mathrm{dist}(\rho I_0, I_1^c) = \inf\{|x - y|; x \in \rho I_0, y \notin I_1\}$ we will show

$$d^p \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_0,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_1^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d \right) = o(1). \tag{4.8}$$

For the latter case, for $\epsilon = \mathrm{dist}((\rho I_0)^c, I_1) = \inf\{|x - y|; x \notin \rho I_0, y \in I_1\}$ we will prove

$$d^p \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_0^c,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_1,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d \right) = o(1). \tag{4.9}$$

On the event $\left\{X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right\}$, we have $X_1^{d*} = X_1^d$. By (4.1) we have

$$\overline{R}_1^{d*} = \rho \overline{R}_0^d + 2\frac{\|X_0^d\|}{d}\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)}\left\langle \frac{X_0^d}{\|X_0^d\|}, W_1^d \right\rangle + (1-\rho)\left(\frac{\|W_1^d\|^2}{d} - 1\right).$$

Therefore, on the events in the left-hand side of (4.8) or (4.9), we have

$$d^{1/2}\epsilon \leq d^{1/2}\left|\overline{R}_1^{d*} - \rho\overline{R}_0^d\right| \leq 2\left(\frac{\|X_0^d\|^2}{d}\right)^{1/2}\left|\left\langle \frac{X_0^d}{\|X_0^d\|}, W_1^d \right\rangle\right| + d^{1/2}\left|\frac{\|W_1^d\|^2}{d} - 1\right|. \tag{4.10}$$

On the event in (4.8), we have $\|X_0^d\|^2/d = \overline{R}_0^d + 1 \leq \sup_{x\in I_0}|x| + 1$, and on the event in (4.9), by triangular inequality together with (2.2), we have

$$\sqrt{\rho}\left(\frac{\|X_0^d\|^2}{d}\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{\|X_1^{d*}\|^2}{d}\right)^{1/2} + \sqrt{1-\rho}\left(\frac{\|W_1^d\|^2}{d}\right)^{1/2} \leq (\sup_{x\in I_1}|x| + 1)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{\|W_1^d\|^2}{d}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Observe that $\left\langle \frac{X_0^d}{\|X_0^d\|}, W_1^d \right\rangle \sim N(0,1)$. Together with this fact and Proposition A.1, the right-hand side of (4.10) is bounded above by a random variable (say) η_d such that $\sup_d \mathbb{E}\left[\eta_d^q\right]^{1/q} < \infty$ for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore (4.8) follows since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_0,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_1^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_0,\ \overline{R}_1^{d*} \in I_1^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(d^{1/2}\epsilon \leq \eta_d\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\eta_d}{d^{1/2}\epsilon}\right)^q\right] = O(d^{-q/2}) = o(d^{-p})\end{aligned}$$

by Chevyshev's inequality by taking $q > 2p$. In the same way, (4.9) can be proved. Now, choose compact subsets I_0, I_1, I_2 so that

$$I_1 \subset \mathrm{int}(\rho I_0),\ \rho I_1 \subset \mathrm{int}(I_2),\ I_0 \cap I_2 = \emptyset.$$

For example, for $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, set $I_1 = [a,b], I_0 = [\rho^{-1+\epsilon}a, \rho^{-1-\epsilon}b]$ and $I_2 = [\rho^{1+\epsilon}a, \rho^{1-\epsilon}b]$ so that $\rho^{2(1-\epsilon)} \leq a/b$ if $a, b > 0$ and $\rho^{2(1+\epsilon)} \leq b/a$ if $a, b < 0$. By (4.8) and (4.9) with reversibility by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_1,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in (I_0 \cap I_2)^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_1,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_0^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_1,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_2^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_0^c,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_1,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_1,\ \overline{R}_1^d \in I_2^c,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) \\ &= o(d^{-p}).\end{aligned}$$

However, since $I_0 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$, the above proves

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\overline{R}_0^d \in I_1,\ X_0^d \neq X_1^d\right) = o(d^{-p}).$$

Since any compact set can be covered by finite family of the compact sets I_1, the claim follows. □

Lemma 4.3. *For $P_d = P_d(Q)$, $\mathrm{pCN}(P_d)$ does not have any polynomial rate of convergence if $Q(\{1\}) < 1$.*

Proof. By assumption, there exists a compact set K such that $K \subset (0,\infty)\setminus\{1\}$ and $Q(\mathrm{int}(K)) \geq \delta$ for $\delta > 0$. By $Q_d \Rightarrow Q$ and by Lemma 4.2, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{d\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\forall i,j < d^p, X_i^d = X_j^d\right) &\geq \liminf_{d\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(R_0^d \in \mathrm{int}(K), \forall i,j < d^p, X_i^d = X_j^d\right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{d\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(R_0^d \in \mathrm{int}(K)) - \limsup_{d\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(R_0^d \in K, \exists i,j < d^p, X_i^d \neq X_j^d\right) \\ &\geq Q(\mathrm{int}(K)) - \limsup_{d\to\infty} d^p\mathbb{P}(R_0^d \in K, X_0^d \neq X_1^d) = Q(\mathrm{int}(K)) \geq \delta.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have the following degenerate property:

$$\liminf_{d\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{d^p}\sum_{m=0}^{d^p-1} f\circ\pi_1(X_m^d) = f\circ\pi_1(X_0^d)\right) \geq \delta$$

for any bounded continuous function $f(x)$ where $\pi_1(x) = x_1$ is the first component of the vector $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assume by the way of contradiction that $X^d \sim \mathrm{pCN}(P_d)$ is weakly consistent with rate T_d where $T_d/d^p \to 0$. Then the following should also be satisfied:

$$\frac{1}{d^p}\sum_{m=0}^{d^p-1} f\circ\pi_1(X_m^d) - P_d(f\circ\pi_1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Recall that $P_d = P_d(Q)$ is the scale mixture of the normal distribution as defined in (3.3). By these two convergence properties together with the fact $\mathcal{L}(\pi_1(X_0^d)) = P_1(Q)$, we have

$$P_1(Q)(\{x; |f(x) - P_1(Q)(f)| < \epsilon\}) = \liminf_{d\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(|f\circ\pi_1(X_0^d) - P_d(f\circ\pi_1)| < \epsilon) \geq \delta$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. By monotone convergence theorem, this is possible only if $P_1(Q)(\{x; f(x) = c\}) \geq \delta$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and thus it is not satisfied for example, for $f(x) = \arctan(x)$ since $P_1(Q)$ has a probability density function. Therefore $\mathrm{pCN}(P_d)$ cannot be weakly consistent with rate T_d where $T_d/d^p \to 0$ for any $p > 0$ and hence $\mathrm{pCN}(P_d)$ cannot have polynomial rate of convergence. □

4.3 Convergence of the MpCN algorithm for heavy-tail case

Let $\left\{X_m^d\right\}_m \sim \mathrm{MpCN}(P_d)$. As in the previous section, we set $r_d(x) = \frac{\|x\|^2}{d}$ $(x \in \mathbb{R}^d)$ and write

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} R_m^d = r_d(X_m^d) \\ R_m^{d*} = r_d(X_m^{d*}) \end{array}\right. , \left\{\begin{array}{l} S_m^d = \pi_k(X_m^d) \\ S_m^{d*} = \pi_k(X_m^{d*}) \end{array}\right. . \tag{4.11}$$

By definition,

$$R_1^{d*} = R_0^d\left(1 + 2d^{-1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}F_d\right) \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$F_d := d^{1/2}\frac{\|X_1^{d*}\|^2 - \|X_0^d\|^2}{2\|X_0^d\|^2\sqrt{1-\rho}} = d^{1/2}\frac{R_1^{d*} - R_0^d}{2R_0^d\sqrt{1-\rho}}. \tag{4.13}$$

Write $y = R_0^d$. Write $\mathbb{P}_y$ and $\mathbb{E}_y$ for the conditional probability and expectation given y.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We rewrite the acceptance ratio $\alpha_d(X_0^d, X_1^{d*})$ in (3.4) as $\alpha_{y,d}(F_d)$ by using F_d:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \beta_{y,d}(F_d) := \tilde{q}_d(R_1^{d*})/\tilde{q}_d(R_0^d) = \tilde{q}_d\left(y\left(1 + 2d^{-1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}F_d\right)\right)/\tilde{q}_d(y), \\ \alpha_{y,d}(F_d) := \min\left\{1, \beta_{y,d}(F_d)\right\}. \end{array}\right.$$

Let

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} a_d(y) & = d\mathbb{E}_y[R_1^d - R_0^d], \\ b_d(y) & = d\mathbb{E}_y[(R_1^d - R_0^d)^2], \\ c_d(y) & = d\mathbb{E}_y[(R_1^d - R_0^d)^4]. \end{array}\right. \tag{4.14}$$

We estimate the triplet. By representation (4.12), we have

$$a_d(y) = d\mathbb{E}_y\left[\left(R_1^{d*} - R_0^d\right)\alpha_{y,d}(F_d)\right] = 2yd^{1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}\mathbb{E}_y[F_d\alpha_{y,d}(F_d)]. \tag{4.15}$$

We are going to estimate the expectation in the right-hand side by using Proposition A.3. Note here that $\alpha'_{y,d} = \beta'_{y,d} 1_{\{\beta_{y,d}<1\}}$ is not bounded since

$$\beta'_{y,d}(F_d) = 2yd^{-1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}\beta_{y,d}(F_d)(\log \tilde{q}_d)'(R_1^{d*}),$$

and $(\log \tilde{q}_d)'$ is not bounded in general. To overcome the difficulty, we put a tempering function $\phi_d : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ which is continuous and $\phi_d(x) = x$ if $|x| \le d^{1/4}$ and piecewise constant otherwise. By Lemma 3.1, the tempered version $\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d} := \alpha_{y,d} \circ \phi_d$ has a bounded derivative

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}'_{y,d}(F_d) &= \alpha'_{y,d}(F_d)1_{\{|F_d|<d^{1/4}\}} = \beta'_{y,d}(F_d)1_{\left\{\beta_{y,d}(F_d)<1, |F_d|<d^{1/4}\right\}} \\ &= 2yd^{-1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}\beta_{y,d}(F_d)(\log \tilde{q}_d)'(R_1^{d*})1_{\left\{\beta_{y,d}(F_d)<1, |F_d|<d^{1/4}\right\}}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\sup_{y\in K_\delta} \|\tilde{\alpha}'_{y,d}\|_\infty = O(d^{-1/2})$ and $\sup_{y\in K_\delta} \|\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}\|_\infty \le 1$ since $R_1^{d*} \in K_{\delta/2}$ for sufficiently large d by (4.12). Therefore we can apply Proposition A.3 to $f(x) = \tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}(x)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{y\in K_\delta} \left|\mathbb{E}_y[F_d\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}(F_d)] - \mathbb{E}_y[\tilde{\alpha}'_{y,d}(F_d)] - d^{-1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}\mathbb{E}_y[\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}(F_d)]\right| \\ &= O\left(\max\left\{d^{-1/2}\sup_{y\in K_\delta}\|\tilde{\alpha}'_{y,d}\|_\infty, d^{-1}\sup_{y\in K_\delta}\|\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}\|_\infty\right\}\right) = O(d^{-1}). \qquad (4.16)\end{aligned}$$

Now we show uniform convergence (in K_δ) of the three expectations in the left-hand side in the above. The first expectation can be estimated by Chevyshev's inequality together with Lemma A.2:

$$|\mathbb{E}_y\left[F_d\alpha_{y,d}(F_d)\right] - \mathbb{E}_y\left[F_d\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}(F_d)\right]| \le \mathbb{E}_y\left[|F_d|, |F_d| \ge d^{1/4}\right] \le d^{-3/4}\mathbb{E}_y\left[|F_d|^4\right] = O(d^{-3/4}).$$

For the uniform convergence of the second and third expectations in the left-hand side of (4.16), suppose that $y_d \in K_\delta$ ($d \in \mathbb{N}$), and so without loss of generality, we can assume that there is a limit $y_d \to y^* \in K_\delta$. By Proposition A.4,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}_{y_d}[\tilde{\alpha}'_{y_d,d}(F_d)] - N[\tilde{\alpha}'_{y_d,d}]| &= o(\sup_{y\in K_\delta}\|\tilde{\alpha}'_{y,d}\|_\infty) = o(d^{-1/2}), \\ |\mathbb{E}_{y_d}[\tilde{\alpha}_{y_d,d}(F_d)] - N[\tilde{\alpha}_{y_d,d}]| &= o(\sup_{y\in K_\delta}\|\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}\|_\infty) = o(1),\end{aligned}$$

as $d \to \infty$ where $Nf = \mathbb{E}[f(X)]$, $X \sim N(0,1)$. By Lemma 3.1, the following convergence (a.s. in the Lebesgue measure) is satisfied for each $f \in \mathbb{R}$ depending on whether $(\log \tilde{q})'(y^*) > 0$ or $(\log \tilde{q})'(y^*) < 0$:

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} 1_{\left\{\beta_{y_d,d}(f)<1\right\}} = 1_{\{f<0\}}, \text{or } 1_{\{f>0\}}$$

where $\tilde{q}(y) = yq(y)$. Also $\lim_{d\to\infty}\beta_{y_d,d}(f) = 1$ is satisfied. By Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} d^{1/2}N[\tilde{\alpha}'_{y_d,d}] = y^*\sqrt{1-\rho}(\log\tilde{q})'(y^*).$$

On the other hand, if $(\log \tilde{q})'(y^*) = 0$, then

$$\lim_{d\to\infty} d^{1/2}N[\tilde{\alpha}'_{y_d,d}] = 0 = y^*\sqrt{1-\rho}(\log\tilde{q})'(y^*)$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. In the same way, $\lim_{d\to\infty} N[\tilde{\alpha}_{y_d,d}(F_d)] = 1$, which completes to show uniform convergence of the three expectations in the left-hand side of (4.16). These uniform convergences yield

$$\sup_{y\in K_\delta}\left|d^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_y[F_d\alpha_{y,d}(F_d)] - y\sqrt{1-\rho}(\log\tilde{q})'(y) - \sqrt{1-\rho}\right| = o(1)$$

as $d \to \infty$. Thus we have

$$d^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_y[F_d\tilde{\alpha}_{y,d}(F_d)] \to \sqrt{1-\rho}(1+y(\log\tilde{q})'(y)) \ (d\to\infty)$$

uniformly in $y \in K_\delta$. Therefore by (4.15), we have

$$d\mathbb{E}_y[R_1^d - R_0^d] \to 2(1-\rho)y(1+y(\log\tilde{q})'(y)) \ (d\to\infty)$$

uniformly in $y \in K_\delta$ which completes the first part of the convergence of the triplet (4.14). We prove the convergence of other two parts in (4.14). By Lemma A.2, $\{F_d^2\}_d$ is $\mathbb{P}_y$-uniformly integrable in d uniformly in $y \in K_\delta$. By Proposition A.4 together with this fact, we have

$$b_d(y) = d\mathbb{E}_y\left[\left(R_1^d - R_0^d\right)^2\right] = 4(1-\rho)y^2\mathbb{E}_y\left[F_d^2\alpha_{y,d}(F_d)\right] \to 4(1-\rho)y^2 \ (d\to\infty)$$

uniformly in $y \in K_\delta$. In the same way, by uniform integrability of $\{F_d^4\}_d$,

$$c_d(y) = d\mathbb{E}_y\left[\left(R_1^d - R_0^d\right)^4\right] \le 4(1-\rho)y^2 d^{-1}\mathbb{E}_y[|F_d|^4] = o(1) \ (d\to\infty).$$

Thus we obtain the uniform convergence of the triplet (4.14) in K_δ. If we prove the existence and uniqueness of the weak solution of the stochastic differential equation (3.5), the convergence $Y^d \Rightarrow Y$ follows from Theorem IX.4.21 of Jacod and Shiryaev (2003).

The existence and uniqueness comes from the standard approach. Let $a(y)$ and $b(y)$ be as in (3.5). Let $c \in (0,\infty)$ and set the scale function $s(x)$ so that

$$s(c) = 0, \ s'(x) = \exp\left(-\int_c^x \frac{2a(u)}{b(u)^2}\mathrm{d}u\right) = \exp\left(-\int_c^x \frac{2}{u} + (\log q)'(u)\mathrm{d}u\right) = \frac{C}{x^2 q(x)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. We use the convention such that $\int_a^b$ is $-\int_b^a$ if $b < a$. By definition, $s(x)$ is a C^2 strictly increasing function. Now we prove

$$\lim_{x\to+\infty} s(x) = +\infty, \ \lim_{x\to 0} s(x) = -\infty. \tag{4.17}$$

By Schwarz's inequality, we have

$$\left|\int_c^x \frac{1}{u}\mathrm{d}u\right| = \left|\int_c^x \sqrt{q(u)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{u^2 q(u)}}\mathrm{d}u\right| \le \left|\int_c^x q(u)\mathrm{d}u\right|^{1/2}\left|\int_c^x \frac{1}{u^2 q(u)}\mathrm{d}u\right|^{1/2}.$$

The left hand side tends to $+\infty$ as $x \to +\infty$ or $x \to +0$ and the first term in the right-hand side is bounded by 1. Therefore (4.17) follows, and $s : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a one-to-one map. By Itô's formula, $Z_t = s(Y_t)$ is the solution of the stochastic differential equation $\mathrm{d}Z_t = \tilde{b}(Z_t)\mathrm{d}W_t$ where $\tilde{b}(x) = C/(\tilde{q}\circ s^{-1})(x)$ for some constant $C > 0$ and for $\tilde{q}(x) = xq(x)$. Thus it has the unique solution by Theorem 5.5.7 of Karatzas and Shreve (1991). By using the solution Z_t, we have the unique solution of (3.5) by $Y_t = s^{-1}(Z_t)$. Hence $Y^d \Rightarrow Y$ follows by Theorem IX.4.21 of Jacod and Shiryaev (2003).

Stationarity and ergodicity of Y is yet to be proved. However stationarity comes from the fact that each Y^d is stationary, and ergodicity comes from that of $\{Z_t\}_t$. Hence the claim follows. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. By Proposition 3.1, first we note that $\sup_{m\le M-1}|R_m^d - R_0^d| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$. By this fact, observe that all proposed values of the MpCN algorithm are accepted for a finite number of iteration $M \in \mathbb{N}$ in probability 1 since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_{m-1}^d = X_m^d \ \exists m \in \{1,\dots,M-1\}) &\le M\mathbb{P}(X_0^d = X_1^d)\\ &= M\left(1 - \mathbb{E}[\alpha(X_0^d, X_1^{d*})]\right)\\ &= M\left(1 - \mathbb{E}\left[\min\left\{1, \frac{\tilde{q}_d(R_1^{d*})}{\tilde{q}_d(R_0^d)}\right\}\right]\right) \to 0\end{aligned}$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and Lemma 3.1. Thus $\left\{(R_m^d, S_m^d)\right\}_m$ defined in (4.11) converges weakly to $\{(R_m, S_m)\}_m$ defined by

$$\begin{cases} R_m = R_0 \\ S_m = \sqrt{\rho} S_{m-1} + \sqrt{1-\rho}(R_0)^{1/2} W_m, \ W_m \sim N_k(0, I_k) \end{cases}$$

for $m \geq 1$, where $R_0 \sim Q$ and $S_0 \sim N_k(0, R_0 I_k)$. By Proposition 3.1, the process $Y^d = \left\{R^d_{[dt]}\right\}_t$ converges to a stationary ergodic process. Hence the claim follows by Lemma B.2. □

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank to Andreas Eberle, Ajay Jasra, Gareth O. Roberts and Masayuki Uchida for fruitful discussions. A part of this work was done when the author was visiting the Institute for Applied Mathematics, Bonn University. The author thanks the Institute for Applied Mathematics, Bonn University for its hospitality.

A Some technical estimates

Set $K_\delta = [\delta, \delta^{-1}]$ for $\delta \in (0,1)$ and fix δ throughout.

A.1 Estimate by using the Wiener chaos

The following is a quick review of Malliavin calculus. For the detail, see monographs such as Nualart (2006) and Nourdin and Peccati (2012).

Abstract Wiener space Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}$ and the norm $\|h\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}} = \langle h, h \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}$. Let $\{W(h); h \in \mathfrak{H}\}$ be an isonormal Gaussian process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, that is, $W(h)$ is centered Gaussian and $\mathbb{E}[W(g)W(h)] = \langle g, h \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}$. The σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ is generated by W. This triplet $(W, \mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{P})$ is called an abstract Wiener space.

Wiener-Chaos decomposition Let $L^2(\Omega)$ be the space of square integrable random variables. Let $H_n(x) = (-1)^n e^{x^2/2} \frac{\mathrm{d}^n}{\mathrm{d}x^n} e^{-x^2/2}$ be the n-th Hermite polynomial. Write $\mathcal{H}_n$ for the linear subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$ generated by $\{H_n(W(h)); h \in \mathfrak{H}\}$. The linear space $\mathcal{H}_n$ is called the n-th Wiener chaos. Then any element $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ can be described by $F = \mathbb{E}[F] + \sum_{n=1}^\infty F_n$ for $F_n \in \mathcal{H}_n$, that is, $L^2(\Omega) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{H}_n$, where $\mathcal{H}_0$ is the set of constants. This is called the Wiener-Chaos decomposition or the Wiener-Itô decomposition.

Fréchet derivative A smooth random variables is a random variable with the form $F = f(W(h_1), \ldots, W(h_n))$ where $h_i \in \mathfrak{H}$ and f is a C^∞ function such that all derivatives have polynomial growth. Then Fréchet derivative of F is defined by

$$DF = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(W(h_1), \ldots, W(h_n)) h_i$$

and so DF is a random variable with values in $\mathfrak{H}$. We set

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{1,2}} := \left(\mathbb{E}\left[|F|^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\|DF\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}\right]\right)^{1/2}.$$

Write $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ for the closure of the space of smooth random variables with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{D}^{1,2}}$ and extend D to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$.

Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is defined by

$$P_t F = \mathbb{E}[F] + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-nt} F_n$$

for $F = \mathbb{E}[F] + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$ ($F_n \in \mathcal{H}_n$). The operator L and L^{-1} is defined by

$$LF = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} -nF_n,\ L^{-1}F = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} -F_n/n$$

where LF can be defined if $\sum n^2 \mathbb{E}[|F_n|^2] < \infty$.

By the so-called hypercontractivity property of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator, we have the following for finite Wiener chaoses. See Corollary 2.8.14 of Nourdin and Peccati (2012) for the proof.

Proposition A.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{H}_n$. Then for $p > 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|F|^p]^{1/p} \leq (p-1)^{n/2} \mathbb{E}[|F|^2]^{1/2}.$$

By using this, we prove the following bounds for the chi-squared distribution.

Lemma A.1. *For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, ξ_d follows the chi-squared distribution with d degrees of freedom. Then*

$$\sup_d d\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d}\right)^{k/2} - 1\right|^2\right] < \infty\ (k \in \mathbb{Z}) \text{ and } \sup_d d^{k/2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{\xi_d}{d} - 1\right|^k\right] < \infty\ (k \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Proof. By definition, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d}\right)^k\right] - 1 = \left(\frac{2}{d}\right)^k \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+k)}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} - 1 \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{d}k\right)^k - 1 = O(d^{-1}). \tag{A.1}$$

Observe that

$$\left\{\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d}\right)^{k/2} - 1\right\}^2 \leq \left\{\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d}\right)^{k/2} - \left(\frac{\xi_d}{d}\right)^{-k/2}\right\}^2 = \sum_{i=\pm k}\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d}\right)^i - 1.$$

Hence the first claim follows from (A.1). Observe that $\xi_d/d - 1$ has the same law as $d^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^d \left(W(e_i)^2 - 1\right)$, which is in the second Wiener chaos in $(W, \mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{P})$. Then the second claim comes from Proposition A.1 since we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|d^{1/2}\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d} - 1\right)\right|^k\right]^{1/k} \leq (k-1)\mathbb{E}\left[\left|d^{1/2}\left(\frac{\xi_d}{d} - 1\right)\right|^2\right]^{1/2} = \sqrt{2}(k-1).$$

□

The following is the key result for our paper. See Theorem 2.9.1 Nourdin and Peccati (2012) for the proof (see also the proof of Theorem 3.1 of Nourdin and Peccati (2009)).

Proposition A.2. *For $F_d \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, suppose that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\left\langle DF_d, -DL^{-1}F_d\right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} - 1\right| = O(d^{-1/2}) \tag{A.2}$$

and F_d has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then for any absolutely continuous function f,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(F_d - \mathbb{E}\left[F_d\right]\right) f(F_d)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[f'(F_d)\right] = O\left(d^{-1/2}\|f'\|_\infty\right).$$

A.2 Representation of random variables for the MpCN algorithm

We introduce an abstract Wiener space to the MpCN algorithm. Write $\mathbb{P}_y$ and $\mathbb{E}_y$ for the conditional probability and the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ given $y = \|X_0^d\|^2/d$ with respectively. Assume that the orthonormal base of $\mathfrak{H}$ is $\{e_i; i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and consider an abstract Wiener space $(W, \mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{P}_y)$ for each $y \in (0, \infty)$. Set

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} = \sup_{y \in K_\delta} \left(\mathbb{E}_y\left[|F|^2\right] + \mathbb{E}_y\left[\|DF\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2\right]\right)^{1/2}.$$

Rewrite random variables defined in (2.3) for $m = 1$ as random variables in $(W, \mathfrak{H}, \mathbb{P}_y)$ by

$$X_1^{d*} = \sqrt{\rho}x + \sqrt{(1-\rho)Z_1^d}W_1^d, \tag{A.3a}$$

$$W_1^d = \sum_{i=1}^d W(e_i)e_i, \tag{A.3b}$$

$$Z_1^d = \frac{yd}{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2} = \frac{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}, \tag{A.3c}$$

where $\tilde{W}_1^d = \sum_{i=1}^d W(e_{-i})e_{-i}$ and $x = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i e_i$ is any value such that $\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2/d = y$. Notice that this representation does not change the law of F_d which is defined in (4.13) and that defined here:

$$F_d = d^{1/2}\frac{\|X_1^{d*}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 - \|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{2\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2\sqrt{1-\rho}}. \tag{A.4}$$

Lemma A.2. *Let* $G_d^k = d^{1/2}\left(\left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{d}\right)^{k/2} - 1\right)$ $(k \in \mathbb{Z})$. *Then for each* $\delta \in (0,1)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\sup_d \|G_d^k\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty, \ \sup_d \|F_d\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty.$$

Also we have

$$\sup_d \sup_{y \in K_\delta} \mathbb{E}_y[|F_d|^4] < \infty.$$

Proof. Note that the law of G_d^k and F_d do not depend on y and so we omit the subscript y in this proof. First we prove $\sup_d \|G_d^k\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty$. The L^2 boundedness $\sup_d \mathbb{E}[|G_d^k|^2] < \infty$ was proved in Lemma A.1. Also

$$\|DG_d^k\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = \left\| k\left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{d}\right)^{k/2-1}\frac{\tilde{W}_1^d}{d^{1/2}}\right\|_{\mathfrak{H}} = k\left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{d}\right)^{(k-1)/2}$$

and hence $\sup_d \mathbb{E}[\|DG_d^k\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2] < \infty$ follows by Lemma A.1. and hence the first claim follows.

Next we show $\sup_d \|F_d\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty$. By (4.3),

$$F_d = \sqrt{\rho}\left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{d}\right)^{-1/2}\left\langle\frac{x}{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}}, W_1^d\right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} + \sqrt{1-\rho}\left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{d}\right)^{-1}\left(d^{-1/2}\frac{\|W_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 - \|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{2}\right). \tag{A.5}$$

It is not difficult to check $H_1^d := \left\langle\frac{x}{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}}, W_1^d\right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $H_2^d := d^{-1/2}\frac{\|W_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 - \|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{2} \in \mathcal{H}_2$ satisfy $\sup_d \|H_i^d\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty$ $(i = 1, 2)$. This, together with the first claim prove $\sup_d \|F_d\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty$ by Hölder's inequality and Minkowski's inequality.

Finally we check $\sup_d \mathbb{E}[|F_d|^4] < \infty$. However by Proposition A.2, $\sup_d \mathbb{E}[|H_i^d|^4]^{1/4} \le 3^{i/2}\sup_d \mathbb{E}[|H_i^d|^2]^{1/2} = 3^{i/2} < \infty$. Hence it is sufficient to show $\sup_d \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{d}\right)^{-4}\right] < \infty$ by Hölder's inequality and Minkowski's inequality. However this comes from Lemma A.1 and hence the claim follows. □

Proposition A.3. *Suppose that f is an absolutely continuous function. Then for $\delta \in (0,1)$,*

$$\sup_{y \in K_\delta} \left| \mathbb{E}_y[F_d f(F_d)] - \mathbb{E}_y[f'(F_d)] - d^{-1/2}\sqrt{1-\rho}\mathbb{E}_y[f(F_d)] \right| = O\left(\max\left\{ d^{-1/2}\|f'\|_\infty, d^{-1}\|f\|_\infty \right\} \right)$$

Proof. We check the conditions in Proposition A.2. Without loss of generality, we can certainly assume that $\|f'\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|f\|_\infty < \infty$ since otherwise the right hand side becomes $+\infty$. We have a decomposition of F_d as in (A.5). Set

$$F_{d,0} = \sqrt{\rho}\left\langle \frac{x}{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}}, W_1^d \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} + \sqrt{1-\rho}\left(d^{-1/2}\frac{\|W_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 - \|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{2} \right).$$

By Lemma A.2 together with Hölder's inequality and Minkowski's inequality, we have

$$d^{1/2}\|F_d - F_{d,0}\|_{\mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}} < \infty. \tag{A.6}$$

By simple algebra,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle DF_{d,0}, -DL^{-1}F_{d,0} \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} &= \left\langle \sqrt{\rho}\frac{x}{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}} + \sqrt{1-\rho}d^{-/2}(W_1^d - \tilde{W}_1^d), \sqrt{\rho}\frac{x}{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}} + \sqrt{1-\rho}d^{-1/2}\frac{W_1^d - \tilde{W}_1^d}{2} \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \\
&= 1 + \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)}d^{-1/2}\left\langle \frac{x}{\|x\|_{\mathfrak{H}}}, W_1^d \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} + (1-\rho)d^{-1}\frac{(\|W_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 - d) + (\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 - d)}{2}
\end{aligned}$$

and so it is straightforward to check $\mathbb{E}_y\left| \left\langle DF_{d,0}, -DL^{-1}F_{d,0} \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} - 1 \right| = O(d^{-1/2})$ uniformly in y. Therefore (A.2) follows from (A.6) by Hölder's and Mikowskii's inequalities together with $\mathbb{E}_y[\|DL^{-1}F\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2] \le \mathbb{E}_y[\|DF\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2]$ for $F \in \mathbb{D}_\delta^{1,2}$. Also, since F_d is a mixture of finite multiple Wiener chaoses, it has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure by Theorem 5.1 of Shigekawa (1980). Thus we can apply Proposition A.2. In the current case,

$$d^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_y[F_d] = \frac{\sqrt{1-\rho}}{2}d\mathbb{E}_y\left[\frac{d}{\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2} - 1 \right] = \sqrt{1-\rho} + O(d^{-1})$$

since the mean of the inverse chi-squared distribution $d/\|\tilde{W}_1^d\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2$ is $1/(d-2)$. □

A.3 Total variation distance and Stein's method

Total variation distance of measures μ and ν on a measurable space $(E, \mathcal{E})$ is defined by

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{E}} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| = \frac{1}{2}\sup\left| \int_E f(x)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) - \int_E f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x) \right|$$

where the second supremum is taken for all $[-1,1]$-valued measurable function on $(E, \mathcal{E})$. The convergence in total variation distance is stronger than weak convergence. However for sequences from finite Wiener chaoses, Nourdin and Poly (2013) obtain the following useful result.

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 5.1 of Nourdin and Poly (2013))**.** *Let $F_n = (F_{n,1}, \dots, F_{n,k})$ be a random vector such that $F_{n,i} \in \mathcal{H}_{h_i}$ for $h_1, \dots, h_k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\mathcal{L}(F_n)$ converges weakly to $N_k(0, C)$ with $\det C > 0$, then the total variation convergence also holds.*

Stein's method is an efficient tool to estimate the total variation distance of probability measures in $\mathbb{R}$. See Chen et al. (2011) for general reference and see also Nourdin and Peccati (2012) for beautiful relation to Malliavin calculus. A fundamental result is that for any measurable function h such that $\|h\|_\infty \le 1$, there is a function f called Stein's solution such that

$$h(x) - Nh = f'(x) - xf(x).$$

Moreover, the solution is absolutely continuous and $\|f\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\pi/2}$ and $\|f'\|_\infty \leq 2$ (see Lemma 2.4 of Chen et al. (2011)). Immediate corollary of this fact is that

$$\|\mathcal{L}(X) - N\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \sup_{f \in \mathfrak{F}} |\mathbb{E}\left[f'(X)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[Xf(X)\right]|$$

where $\mathfrak{F}$ is a set of functions such that $\|f\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\pi/2}$ and $\|f'\|_\infty \leq 2$. In particular, we have the following.

Proposition A.4. *For $\delta > 0$ and the random variable F_d defined in (A.4), $\sup_{y \in K_\delta} \|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}_y}(F_d) - N\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \to 0$.*

Stein's method was a basic tool in Kamatani (2014b) and implicitly used throughout in this paper.

B Elements of consistency of MCMC

B.1 Some sufficient conditions for consistency

The following lemma is a fundamental result for consistency of MCMC.

Lemma B.1 (Lemma 2 of Kamatani (2014a))**.** *Let $\xi^d = \{\xi^d_m\}_m$ be a sequence of stationary process on $\mathbb{R}^k$. If ξ^d converges in law to $\xi = \{\xi_m\}_m$, and if ξ is a stationary ergodic process, then the law of ξ^d is consistent in the sense of (3.1).*

We need a slightly generalization of this lemma. Let $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{R}^{k_1+k_2}$-valued random variable X^d_m has two parts, $X^d_m = (X^{d,1}_m, X^{d,2}_m)$ where $X^{d,i}_m$ is $\mathbb{R}^{k_i}$ valued for each $i = 1, 2$. Corresponding to $X^{d,1}$ and $X^{d,2}$, the invariant probability measure has the following decomposition

$$P_d(\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2) = P^1_d(\mathrm{d}x_1)P^2_d(\mathrm{d}x_2|x_1).$$

Furthermore, we assume the following. Let $T_d \to \infty$. Let $[x]$ be the integer part of $x \geq 0$.

Assumption 2.
1. *For $Y^{d,1}_t = X^{d,1}_{[T_d t]}$, $Y^{d,1} \Rightarrow Y^1$ (in Skorohod's sense) where Y^1 is stationary and ergodic continuous process with the invariant probability measure P^1.*
2. *Random variables $X^d = \{X^d_m\}_m$ converges to $X = \{X_m\}_m = \{(X^1_0, X^2_m(X^1_0))\}_m$ where $X^2(x) = \{X^2_m(x)\}_m$ is a stationary and ergodic process with the invariant probability measure $P^{2|1}(\cdot|x)$ for each x, and $X^1_0 \sim P^1$.*
3. *For any bounded continuous function f, $P^{2|1}f(x_1) = \int f(x_1, x_2)P^{2|1}(\mathrm{d}x_2|x_1)$ is continuous in x_1.*

The proof of the following lemma is essentially same as Lemma B.2 of Kamatani (2014b). Thus we omit it.

Lemma B.2. *Under the above assumption,*

$$\frac{1}{M_d}\sum_{m=0}^{M_d-1} f(X^d_m) - P_d(f) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

for any continuous and bounded function f and for $M_d \to \infty$ such that $M_d/T_d \to \infty$.

B.2 Consistency of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

We prove consistency of the Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm. For probability measures P, Q and a transition kernel K on $(E, \mathcal{E})$, we introduce an operator $\otimes$ and T for any set $A \times B = \{(x, y); x \in A, y \in B\}$ by

$$(P \otimes K)(A \times B) = \int_A P(\mathrm{d}x)K(x, B),\ (P \otimes K)^T(A \times B) = (P \otimes K)(B \times A)$$

and extend them to probability measures on $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes 2}$ by Hahn-Kolmogorov's theorem. We introduce another operator $\wedge$ by

$$(P \wedge Q)(\mathrm{d}x) = \min\{p(x), q(x)\}\,\sigma(\mathrm{d}x).$$

where $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are the Radon-Nikodým derivatives of P and Q with respect to a σ-finite measure $\sigma(\mathrm{d}x)$. Let $X^n = \{X^n_m; m \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ be a stationary Markov chain with the transition kernel K_n with the initial distribution P_n, and let $X = \{X_m; m \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ be that for the transition kernel K with the initial distribution P.

Lemma B.3 (Lemmas 2 and 3 of Kamatani (2014a))**.** *Let K and K_n $(n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ be transition kernels that have the invariant probability distributions P and P_n with respectively. If $\|P_n \otimes K_n - P \otimes K\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \to 0$, then X^n tends to X in law.*

Thus $\|P_n \otimes K_n - P \otimes K\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \to 0$ with ergodicity of K is a set of sufficient conditions for consistency. The transition kernel K of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with the proposal transition kernel $Q(x, \mathrm{d}y) = q(x, y)\sigma(\mathrm{d}y)$ (q is supposed to be $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes 2}$-measurable) is

$$K(x, \mathrm{d}y) = Q(x, \mathrm{d}y) \min\left\{1, \frac{p(y)q(y, x)}{p(x)q(x, y)}\right\} + R(x)\delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)$$

where

$$R(x) = 1 - \int_{y \in E} Q(x, \mathrm{d}y) \min\left\{1, \frac{p(y)q(y, x)}{p(x)q(x, y)}\right\}. \tag{B.1}$$

Thus

$$(P \otimes K)(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) = (P \otimes Q) \wedge (P \otimes Q)^T(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) + PR(\mathrm{d}x)\delta_x(\mathrm{d}y)$$

where

$$PR(\mathrm{d}x) := P(\mathrm{d}x)R(x) = P(\mathrm{d}x) - (P \otimes Q) \wedge (P \otimes Q)^T(\mathrm{d}x \times E). \tag{B.2}$$

The following lemma shows that the total variation convergence of the transition kernel of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm comes from that of the proposal transition kernel.

Lemma B.4. *Suppose K_1 and K_2 are transition kernels of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with the proposal transition kernels Q_1 and Q_2 and the target probability distribution P_1 and P_2 with respectively. Then*

$$\|P_1 \otimes K_1 - P_2 \otimes K_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 6\|P_1 \otimes Q_1 - P_2 \otimes Q_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}}.$$

Proof. By triangular inequality,

$$\|P_1 \otimes K_1 - P_2 \otimes K_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \|(P_1 \otimes Q_1) \wedge (P_1 \otimes Q_1)^T - (P_2 \otimes Q_2) \wedge (P_2 \otimes Q_2)^T\|_{\mathrm{TV}} + \|P_1R_1 - P_2R_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$$

where $R_i(x)$ is the rejection probability defined in (B.1) of the transition kernel K_i for $i = 1, 2$. By (B.2), the second term in the right-hand side of the above is dominated by twice of the first term. To find a bound of the first term, observe that for any $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $|x_1 \wedge x_2 - y_1 \wedge y_2| \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 |x_i - y_i|$ where $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$. By this inequality, $\|\mu_1 \wedge \mu_2 - \nu_1 \wedge \nu_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\mu_i - \nu_i\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_1 \otimes K_1 - P_2 \otimes K_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} &\leq 3\|(P_1 \otimes Q_1) \wedge (P_1 \otimes Q_1)^T - (P_2 \otimes Q_2) \wedge (P_2 \otimes Q_2)^T\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \\ &\leq 6\|P_1 \otimes Q_1 - P_2 \otimes Q_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}}.\end{aligned}$$

□

References

Alexandros Beskos, Gareth Roberts, and Andrew Stuart. Optimal scalings for local Metropolis-Hastings chains on nonproduct targets in high dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 19(3):863–898, 2009. ISSN 1050-5164. doi: 10.1214/08-AAP563.

Louis H.Y. Chen, Larry Goldstein, and Qi-Man Shao. *Normal Approximation by Stein's Method*. Probability and Its Applications. Berlin, Heidelberg : Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011., 2011. ISBN 9783642150074.

S. L. Cotter, G. O. Roberts, A. M. Stuart, and D. White. MCMC methods for functions: modifying old algorithms to make them faster. *Statist. Sci.*, 28(3):424–446, 2013. ISSN 0883-4237. doi: 10.1214/13-STS421.

Andreas Eberle. Error bounds for Metropolis-Hastings algorithms applied to perturbations of Gaussian measures in high dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(1):337–377, 2014. ISSN 1050-5164. doi: 10.1214/13-AAP926.

Martin Hairer, Andrew M. Stuart, and Sebastian J. Vollmer. Spectral gaps for a Metropolis–Hastings algorithm in infinite dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(6):2455–2490, 2014. ISSN 1050-5164. doi: 10.1214/13-AAP982.

Jean Jacod and Albert N. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2nd edition, 2003.

Kengo Kamatani. Local consistency of Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 66 (1):63–74, 2014a. ISSN 0020-3157. doi: 10.1007/s10463-013-0403-3.

Kengo Kamatani. Rate optimality of Random walk Metropolis algorithm in high-dimension with heavy-tailed target distribution. *Arxiv*, 2014b. URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.5392`.

Kengo Kamatani and Masayuki Uchida. Hybrid multi-step estimators for stochastic differential equations based on sampled data. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.*, 2014. doi: 10.1007/s11203-014-9107-4i. to appear.

Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus.* Number 113 in Graduate texts in mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 2nd ed edition, 1991.

Ivan Nourdin and Giovanni Peccati. Stein's method on Wiener chaos. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 145 (1-2):75–118, 2009. ISSN 0178-8051. doi: 10.1007/s00440-008-0162-x.

Ivan Nourdin and Giovanni Peccati. *Normal approximations with Malliavin calculus. From Stein's method to universality*, volume 192 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. ISBN 978-1-107-01777-1. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139084659.

Ivan Nourdin and Guillaume Poly. Convergence in total variation on Wiener chaos. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 123(2):651–674, 2013. ISSN 0304-4149. doi: 10.1016/j.spa.2012.10.004.

David Nualart. *The Malliavin calculus and related topics.* Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006. ISBN 978-3-540-28328-7; 3-540-28328-5.

Natesh S. Pillai, Andrew M. Stuart, and Alexandre H. Thiery. Optimal Proposal Design for Random Walk Type Metropolis Algorithms with Gaussian Random Field Priors. *Arxiv*, 2014. URL `http://xxx.tau.ac.il/abs/1108.1494v2`.

Christian P. Robert and George Casella. *Monte Carlo statistical methods.* Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2004. ISBN 0-387-21239-6. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-4145-2.

Gareth O. Roberts and Jeffrey S. Rosenthal. Optimal scaling of discrete approximations to langevin diffusions. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 60(1):255–268, 1998. ISSN 1467-9868. doi: 10.1111/1467-9868.00123.

Gareth O. Roberts, Andrew Gelman, and Walter R. Gilks. Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk Metropolis algorithms. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 7(1):110–120, 1997. ISSN 1050-5164. doi: 10.1214/aoap/1034625254.

Ichiro Shigekawa. Derivatives of Wiener functionals and absolute continuity of induced measures. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 20(2):263–289, 1980. ISSN 0023-608X.

Luke Tierney. Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 22(4):1701–1762, 1994. ISSN 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176325750. With discussion and a rejoinder by the author.